UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,733	07/12/2001	Aviad Zlotnick	ZLOTNICK=2	9520

1444   7590   12/11/2006

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER
DESIRE, GREGORY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

DEC 11 2006

Technology Center 2600

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/902,733
Filing Date: July 12, 2001
Appellant(s): ZLOTNICK, AVIAD

Norman J. Latker
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/24/06 appealing from the Office action

mailed 11/17/05.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

| 5,950,190 | Yeager et al | 9-1999 |
| 6,628,832 | Kanatsu | 9-2003 |

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-13, 16-19, 22-24 and 27-30 and 33 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yeager et al (5,950,190).

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 1, 12 and 23 Yeager

discloses,

Presenting the data to the operator in a plurality of data fields (note fig. 4 block

53, shows plurality of data fields on the display) on the computer display (note fig. 4

block 50 and col. 9 lines 36-40 and 63-65, search window generated by dynamic

graphical user interface, which presents data to the user on a computer, window

environment is operated on a computer);

Placing multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control at different

locations on the display (note fig. 4. blocks 52 and 54, at the Barcode field pull down list

has 6 specific operators at Barcode location, at Partno field (different location) a

redundant instances of pull down list having same specific operators as Barcode

location) in proximity to different ones of the fields (note 54 instances of the control are

in proximity to different ones of fields 54) for selection by the operator using a pointing

device linked to the display (note col. 10 lines 36-38); and

Actuating the control responsive to the selection by the operator of any of the

instances of the control on the display (note col. 10 line 60-65, clicking button 52,

actuates the control responsive to the selection by the operator of an instance of the

control on the display).

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 2, 13 and 24 Yeager

discloses,

Wherein actuating the control comprises receiving an input from the

operator to indicated that the data are verified (note col. 10 lines 54-57 and col. 11 lines

10-15). Examiner interprets user-inputting entries into search fields as receiving an

indication from the operator and formulation of search query as an input from the

operator and to indicate the data are verified is the result of the execution of the query.

Regarding method, apparatus, and computer software claims 5, 16 and 27 Yeager

discloses,

Wherein the multiple redundant instances of the on-screen control (note

fig. 7 parameter buttons 82 and buttons on the right are multiple redundant instances of

the on screen control) all indicate that the operator has finished processing the data in

the plurality of the fields (note buttons on the right in fig. 7 and col. 12 lines 61-67 and

col. 13 lines 1-11, once data is entered in the fields, save button, update button, add

button, done button multiple redundant buttons that indicate that operator has finished

processing entries).

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 6, 17 and 28 Yeager

discloses,

Wherein placing the instances comprises interspersing the instances of the

control between the data fields (note fig. 4, block 54, instances are interspersed

between data fields 52 and 53).

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 7, 18 and 29 Yeager

discloses,

Wherein the locations of the multiple instances are so as to minimize a traverse

of the pointing device required to select one of the instances (Note fig. 4, block 54,

multiple locations of controls placed next to each field identified by part 53 minimize a

traverse of the pointing device).

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 8, 19 and 30 Yeager

discloses,

Wherein presenting the data comprises displaying in the fields characters from a

document to which codes have been assigned so that the operator can verify that the

assigned codes are correct (note fig. 4, 53 and col. 10 line 66 to col. 11 line 33). Which

reads on user selecting an entry with the list of possible description. SQL command

reads on the code. Data shown provides correct results.

Regarding apparatus claims 11, 22 and 33 Yeager discloses,

Wherein the multiple instances comprises providing three or more instances of

the control on screen (note fig. 4 depict multiple instances of control 54 by the clicking of

six different arrows).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 3, 9-10,14, 20-21, 25 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Kanatsu (6,628,832).

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims claim 3, 14 and 25

Yeager discloses a database containing data tables (note fig. 1 block 24).

However, Yeager does not clearly disclose wherein presenting the data comprises

presenting results of optical character recognition (OCR) for verification by the operator.

Kanatsu discloses converting document data having a table format into electronic data

using OCR (note col. 1 lines 10-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an OCR in the

system of Yeager. Converting data table to electronic form (note col. 1 lines 10-14)

would have highly desirable feature in a data management system due to its

computerized functions and Kanatsu recognizes converting to electronic form would be

expected when an OCR is used in Yeager.

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 9, 20 and 31 Yeager does

not disclose expressly,

Displaying the characters comprises displaying results of optical character

recognition (OCR) processing. Kanatsu discloses displaying the characters comprises

displaying results of optical character recognition (OCR) processing (note Kanatsu fig. 1

block 15, data table in electronic form (by OCR) is displayed by a display 15). Yeager

and Kanatsu are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the

time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person ordinary skill in the art to display results of OCR processing in the system of Yeager as disclosed by Kanatsu. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been displaying analysis results (note col. 3 lines 57-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Yeager with Kanatsu to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 20 and 31.

Regarding method, apparatus and computer software claims 10, 21 and 32 Yeager discloses,

Displaying together a plurality of the characters a field (note Yeager fig. 4 and col. 10 shows display of plurality of characters "camera") Yeager does not disclose expressly assigning the same code by the OCR processing. Kanatsu discloses assigning characters with character codes (note col. 7 lines 42-46, characters converted to character codes. Yeager and Kanatsu are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign character code by OCR processing in the system of Yeager as evidenced by Kanatsu. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been obvious to efficiently correct data (note col. 7 lines 47-55. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Yeager and Kanatsu to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 21 and 32.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues (argument page 9 lines 20- page 10 line 2) there is no mention

of pull down arrows in Yeager's specification, so that examiner's position is

unsupported. To clarify the examiner's position, it is the position of the examiner

Yeager does provide support for (pull down arrows) multiple redundant instances of an

on screen control as claimed (note col. 23 line 59- col. 24 line 1 and fig. 1 and fig. 4,

also fig. 7 block 82, 83 and buttons on the right). The lines cite parameter buttons 52;

input fields 53 and operator pull down lists are built for each column of the table. Col.

10 lines 19-20 describe the columns as six different columns from the joined table 25

and 26 in fig. 1. Thus, examiner interprets for each column from the joined table (i.e.

Barcode, partno, description, location, status and remarks) parameter buttons 52, input

fields 53 and pull down-lists 54 are built in the search window. The operator pull down

list (fig. 4, block 54) and parameter buttons that are built for each corresponding column

examiner interprets as multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control as claimed.

Each pull down list has multiple redundant mathematical operators, from the figures can

be obtained by arrows between parameter buttons 52 and input fields 53.

Appellant argues (argument page 10 lines 5-7) Yeager neither teaches nor

suggests placing multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control on a display.

This argument is not persuasive because it is the position of the examiner Yeager does

teach placing multiple redundant instances of an on screen control on a display (note

fig. 4 and col. 10 lines 10-51, col. 23 line 59- col. 24 line1 and col. 24 lines 27-37).

Search window 50 in fig. 4 of the graphic user interface examiner interprets as the
display.   Search window is built to include multiple redundant instances of parameter
button 52, multiple redundant instances of arrows between 52 and 53 arrows of the pull
down lists and other multiple redundant buttons in the search window.

Appellant argues (argument page 10 lines 11-12) examiner has entirely ignored
the meaning redundant. It is the position of the examiner has not ignored the meaning
of redundant. Examiner interprets Yeager building parameter button 52, pull down list
and input fields for each column is excessive. Also, six mathematical operators of the
pull down list are redundant/excessive. If the appellant wanted to give the claims a
specific meaning it should be explicit in the claims.

Appellant argues (argument page 14 lines 6-14) Yeager does not mention data
verification of any sort of operation that might be considered equivalent to verification in
claims 2, 13 and 24. The claim language is wherein actuating the control comprises
receiving an input from the operator to indicate the data are verified (note col. 10 lines
54-57 and col. 11 lines 10-15). Examiner interprets user-inputting entries into search
fields as receiving an input from the operator and formulation of search query as an
input from the operator and to indicate the data are verified is the result of the execution
of the query.

Appellant argues (argument page 15 lines 11-16) Yeager does not teach the elements of claims 5, 16 and 17. Wherein the multiple redundant instance of the on-screen control all indicate that the operator has finished processing the data in the plurality of the fields. It is the position of the examiner Yeager does teach multiple redundant instances of the on screen control (note fig. 7 parameter buttons 82 and buttons on the right are multiple redundant instances of the on screen control) all indicate that operator has finished processing the data in the plurality of fields (note buttons on the right in fig. 7 and col. 12 lines 61-67 and col. 13 lines 1-11, once data is entered in the fields, save button, update button, add button, done button multiple redundant buttons that indicate that operator has finished processing entries).

Appellant argues (argument page 15 lines 21-25) Yeager does teach multiple instances of the control indicating that the operator has finished processing the data in all of the fields be located on the display in proximity to different ones of the fields as required by claims 1 and 5 combined. This argument is not persuasive because it is the position of the examiner Yeager does discloses controls located in proximity to different ones of the fields (note fig. 7, field 83 is located in proximity to buttons on the right).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

GMD

Conferees:

MB

JW

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

JINGGE WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER